

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the office action mailed December 16, 2004 for the above-identified patent application.

35 U.S.C. 112

The above amendment to claim 20 is believed to overcome the rejection based on 35 U.S.C. 112. In particular, the above amendment changes the word "method" in line 2 of claim 20 to the correct term "system". Accordingly, claims 20-21 are now believed properly drawn to a system.

35 U.S.C. 102

With respect to the Examiner's rejection under 35 USC 102 based on the US patent 5,307,295 to Taylor, it is believed that the above amendments clarify the patentable features of applicants intervention which distinguish over Taylor.

The Examiner observed that the applicants arguments for entering a simple shape only one time was not clear in the claims as previously submitted. The addition of the word "single" and the phrase "a single time" in the above-amended claims is believed to further clarify this limitation and in doing so, renders the claims patentable over this rejection.

Dated this 7<sup>th</sup> day of February, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



Roger J. French  
Reg. No. 27,786  
BEEM PATENT LAW FIRM  
53 W. Jackson Blvd, Suite 1352  
Chicago IL 60604-3787  
Tel. (312) 201-0011  
Fax (312) 201-0022